REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the claims to overcome the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

The Examiner objected to Claims 3 and 14. Applicants have amended Claims 3 and 14 to include the correct spelling of "associated". Applicants believe this objection is now moot.

DRAWINGS

Applicants have attached revised Figures 3 and 4 to include previously missing call out numbers. On the replacement sheet that includes Figure 3, Applicants have added call out number **220** to identify the remote user interface applet as described on page 13, line 22 of the Application as originally filed. Additionally, Applicants have added call out number **222** to identify the memory device as described on page 14, line 2 of the Application as originally filed. On the replacement sheet that includes Figure 4, Applicants have added call out number **108** to identify the soft data bus as described on page 9, line 10 of the Application as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 2, 13 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 13 to provide proper antecedent basis. The limitation "the internet protocol" has been replaced with "an internet protocol" in Claims 2 and 13.

Applicants have amended Claim 23 to provide proper antecedent basis. The limitation "said power system" has been replaced with "said telecommunications power system".

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that the stated grounds for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are now moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,418) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,571,153).

Regarding Claim 1, Collins et al. do not show, teach, or suggest a remote user interface system to enable a remote browser application to monitor and control a power system of the type having one or more rectifier subsystems, one or more reserve power subsystems and one or more power distribution subsystems.

Collins et al. teach an energy management system for monitoring and analyzing power consumption from different locations. Energy monitoring devices that include electric utility meters from one or more locations are connected to a computer network such as the Internet (col. 3, line 51). A primary server is also connected to the computer network and receives energy usage data from the energy monitoring devices. The primary server and an associated database perform an energy cost analysis and

generate energy usage statistics based on the energy usage data (col. 6, line 36). One or more remote monitoring stations communicate with the primary server across the computer network to review the energy usage data (col. 7, line 19).

The remote monitoring stations taught by Collins et al. monitor but do not control the energy monitoring devices. For example, the remote monitoring stations do not change the operating parameters of the energy monitoring devices when a problem is detected. Furthermore, the remote monitoring stations neither monitor nor control a rectifier subsystem, a reserve power subsystem, and a power distribution subsystem of a power system. The energy monitoring devices include usage and billing meters for electricity, gas, and water utilities. The remote monitoring stations and the primary server monitor the energy monitoring devices as well as the usage of a UPS and generator for billing purposes and to determine peak usage times (col. 8, lines 10-20).

Collins et al. do not show, teach, or suggest a monitor and control system coupled to the power system for providing operating state information to at least one of the subsystems, as required by the claims.

Collins et al. teach connecting energy monitoring devices directly to a computer network (col. 3, line 51). The energy monitoring devices supply energy usage data across the computer network to the primary server. The remote monitoring stations receive energy usage statistics from the primary server (col. 7, line 35). Neither the remote monitoring stations nor the primary server provides operating state information to the energy monitoring devices. Additionally, a monitor and control system is not coupled to the energy monitoring devices that is capable of providing operating state information to the energy monitoring devices.

Therefore, in the energy management system taught by Collins et al., an on-site technician is required to change the operating parameters of an energy monitoring device. On page 2, line 1 of the Application as originally filed, Applicants teach that power supply systems for telecommunications equipment are regularly subjected to electrical storms and other natural phenomena that create power outages on the electrical power grid to which power supplies are connected. Skilled engineers may be required to make changes to the system in these cases and are expensive.

Collins et al. do not show, teach, or suggest a user interface manager being operative to receive data values generated by an applet in response to user interaction via the user interface and to communicate the data values to a data storage system for use in controlling the electric power system, as required by the claims.

Neither the remote monitoring stations nor the primary server taught by Collins et al. transmits data values to the database for use in controlling an electric power system. The energy monitoring devices transmit energy usage data to the primary server so that energy usage data and billing statistics can be analyzed and stored in the database. Collins et al. teach that the remote monitoring stations review energy usage data stored and analyzed in a database of the primary server (col. 7, line 35). The energy usage data and billing statistics are not used to control the energy monitoring devices.

Maeda et al. fail to remedy the shortcomings of Collins et al. Maeda et al. generally teach a method for controlling a protective control system of an electric power system as well as a storage medium that stores a program module. Protective control devices in an electric power system communicate across a communication network. The protective control devices execute a control operation according to a program

module. The program module migrates through the communication network along a predetermined route (col. 12, line 1). The program module is universally programmed and migrated between all of the protective control devices (col. 12, line 27). Maeda et al. do not teach obtaining operating state information from or providing operating state information to a power system including a rectifier subsystem, a reserve power subsystem, and a power distribution subsystem of a power system.

Claims 2-11 depend directly or independently from Claim 1 and are allowable over Collins et al. and Maeda et al. for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 12, Collins et al. do not show, teach, or suggest a remote user interface system to enable a remote browser application to monitor and control a power system. Collins et al. also do not show, teach, or suggest a monitor and control system that is coupled to a power system for providing operating state information to the power system.

As discussed above, remote monitoring stations taught by Collins et al. monitor but do not control energy monitoring devices. The energy monitoring devices supply energy usage data across a computer network to a primary server, and the remote monitoring stations receive energy usage statistics from the primary server. Neither the remote monitoring stations nor the primary server provides operating state information to the energy monitoring devices. Additionally, a monitor and control system is not coupled to the energy monitoring devices that is capable of providing operating state information to the energy monitoring devices.

Collins et al. do not show, teach, or suggest a user interface manager being operative to provide an executable applet to a remote browser application, the applet

generating a user interface within the remote browser application for monitoring and controlling the power system.

The remote monitoring stations taught by Collins et al. do not include applets that generate user interfaces for monitoring and controlling a power system. The remote monitoring stations review energy usage data that is stored and analyzed in a database of a primary server. The energy usage data is supplied by energy monitoring devices. For example, the remote monitoring stations do not generate data values that can be used to control the energy monitoring devices.

Maeda et al. fail to remedy the shortcomings of Collins et al. As discussed above, Maeda et al. teaches that protective control devices execute a control operation according to a program module. The program module migrates through the communication network along a predetermined route. The program module is universally programmed and migrated between all of the protective control devices. A remote browser application does not monitor and control a power system.

Applicants teach that subsystem monitor and control modules are coupled to the subsystems and the data storage system. On page 10, line 5, Applicants teach the user interface manager as coupled to the data storage system and the remote browser application. The remote browser application is operated by a user to change operating parameters of the subsystems. The subsystem monitor and control modules query the data storage system to detect changes in operating parameters. When detected, the subsystem monitor and control modules update the subsystem hardware settings to reflect the changes. The user witnesses the effects of the changes in real-time, and an off-site technician is not needed.

Claims 13-22 depend directly or independently from Claim 12 and are allowable over Collins et al. and Maeda et al. for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 23, Collins et al. does not show, teach, or suggest sending control information generated by an applet on a computer than communicates with a telecommunications power system to a processor powered by the telecommunications power system via a network. Collins et al. also do not show, teach, or suggest using control information to change the operating state of the telecommunications power system.

As discussed above, Collins et al. teach that energy monitoring devices transmit energy usage data to a database that is coupled to a primary server. Remote monitoring stations monitor but do not control the energy monitoring devices. The remote monitoring stations review the energy usage data in the database. The remote monitoring stations do not send control information to the primary server to change the operating state of a power system. For example, neither the remote monitoring stations nor the primary server change operating parameters of the energy monitoring devices.

Maeda et al. fail to remedy the shortcomings of Collins et al. The protective control devices as taught by Maeda et al. execute a control operation according to a program module. The program module is universally programmed and migrated between all of the protective control devices. The program module does not control a telecommunications power system.

Claims 24-28 depend directly or independently from Claim 23 and are allowable over Collins et al. and Maeda et al. for the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/8/03

By: _____
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDW/ss